



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tion, reward, second coming. One of the great virtues of this book is its concentration of New Testament theology into one short view. Christianity passes rapidly before the reader's eyes in one clear picture. It is, of course, necessary that the proof-texts should be named, yet it would be a good thing, if it were only possible in a business way, if the text could be given as one clear essay in another edition, an edition for cursory reading. This book should be translated into English, but by a good translator, not by a beginner. Perhaps in the translation the proof-texts could be given in an appendix, page for page, but the essay itself should then contain no numbers or signs. The texts for the page in order would be clear enough.

Schleiermacher said that practical theology was the crown of theology. He was right. Bernhard Weiss has written for years theological books of all kinds, and especially commentaries, and in his short commentary to the whole New Testament with his own Greek text he has given a handbook for theological students. But now he should crown it all with a popular commentary, accompanying the German text, and that not too short a commentary. The church itself should have a share in his ripe work.

CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG.

THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

It was a complaint of the elder Delitzsch, twenty-five years ago, that modern Old Testament criticism criticised too much, and constructed too little. This has often been re-echoed since. But, of course, construction has from the first been its logical aim. Whether this work was delayed too long can be fairly determined only in view of the obstacles to be cleared away, and with some appreciation of the difficulties which the fresh constructions involve. Now, at all events, the work is going on quickly. The literature of Old Testament study, particularly in English, has been transformed within twenty years—almost within ten.

The books of Kings were not among the first to receive systematic attention, although the surprising light from the monuments led to many discussions of certain parts. Old Testament history was rewritten, and Old Testament histories published, from the modern point of view, before a complete treatment of the historical documents of the royal period was in the hands of students. Until the appearance of Ben-

zinger's *Könige* in 1899, and Kittel's in 1900, there was no commentary on Kings in any language which a modern teacher could commend to his pupils with real satisfaction. Burney's¹ is the first of such books in English.

I must at once qualify this remark by saying that it is not precisely a commentary, as the term is generally understood. The textual and the grammatical predominate, as the title suggests. There is more remark upon the structure and composition of the book than the title really demands, though none too much for the student's good. Of historical discussion there is very little. The scope and manner of Mr. Burney's work are, in a word, modeled upon Professor Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, with some modifications in detail.

He shows the training of a sound school. The thorough philological knowledge, dispassionate observation, accuracy, intellectual caution, sobriety and calmness of judgment, which give Professor Driver his commanding influence in the Old Testament study of Great Britain at the present time, work their work through his books, but also through the pupils whom he trains. Such younger men as C. F. Burney, G. A. Cooke, A. E. Cowley, G. B. Gray, J. F. Stenning—to name no others—have learned the solid worth of his method, and use it, to the advantage of scholarship, in various individual combinations. "To his teaching and example," Mr. Burney modestly says in his preface, "is due most of what may be of value in this book." This does not mean borrowing, or imitation, but inwrought habits of treatment. The result is an excellent book for students. A careful use of it will promote knowledge of these important historical writings, and aid, in turn, in the sound training of those who are to be busied with the Bible. It is of course highly technical, and an adequate review of it must share this character.

"Notes on the Text" puts textual questions at once to the fore. Here we have no startling novelties, but, as the main feature, a careful registration of such current proposals for textual change on the basis of the versions, as Mr. Burney, with independent judgment, accepts. He heartily acknowledges and frequently specifies the work of Thenius, Wellhausen, Klostermann, Kamphausen, Hooykaas, Benzinger, Kittel,

¹ *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*. With an Introduction and Appendix. By REV. C. F. BURNEY, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Hebrew of S. John Baptist's College, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903; New York: Henry Frowde. xlviii + 384 pages.

and—especially, of course, on the building enterprises of Solomon—Stade. There is also discriminating inquiry into the real significance of the readings cited from the versions, and occasionally an entirely new suggestion.

Among the less familiar changes are the following :

1 Kings 1 : 26*b*, בָּנָה for עֲבָדָה, with Luc., Klost., and Hooykaas ; vs. 28, the omission of the first לְפָנַי הַמֶּלֶךְ, with the same ; 2 : 5, וַיָּשֶׂם for וַיִּקָּם, with Luc., Vet. Lat., Klost., Hooykaas, and Kittel ; vs. 29, the long insertion of LXX, Luc., after וַיִּשְׁלַח שְׁלֹמֹה, with Böttcher, Klost., and Kittel ; 5 : 14, the insertion of וַיִּקָּה מִנְהָה before מֵאֵת, with Luc., Pesh., Klost., and Hooykaas ; 8 : 12, 13, the preference of the Greek to the Hebrew form of Solomon's dedicatory lines, with Wellh. ; 11 : 23–25, the reading of LXX, Luc., with Klost., Benzinger, Kittel, and Oort ; 13 : 34, לְחֻשָּׁא לְבֵית יִרְבָּעָם, with LXX, Luc., Pesh., Thenius, Kamph., Klost., Benz., and Kittel—we must surely follow these authorities also in reading בְּדִבְרֵי for הַדְּבָרִי ;—18 : 5, וְלֹא תִפְרֹת מִמֶּנּוּ בַּהֲמָה, with Luc. and Wellh. ; 19 : 2, the insertion of אִם אֵתָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ וְאֲנִי אֵיזָבֵל, with LXX, Luc., and Thenius (but the idiom is questionable, and the heaping up of asseverative phrases hardly probable, cf. Benz.) ; 2 Kings 4 : 35, omission of יְיָ וַיִּזְוֹרֶר, with LXX, regarding וַיִּזְוֹרֶר as dittography for וַיִּגְדֵּה, with Grätz ; 10 : 32, לְקִצֹּץ for לְקִצּוֹת, with Vulg. and Klost. ; and many more. In addition to deciding on such previous suggestions, Mr. Burney offers some of his own, such as these : 1 Kings 7 : 47, 46, 48, the order of LXX, Luc., and the text (mainly) of Luc. (here Benz. agrees in part) ; 8 : 33, the insertion of לְפָנַי וְנִפְלִי before לְפָנַי אוֹיֵב, with Luc. (where, however, the parallelism of Yahweh with the enemy seems doubtful) ; 9 : 24, substantially the reading of LXX, Luc. (in vs. 9), the establishing of the daughter of Pharaoh being then (apparently) understood as co-ordinate with the building of Millo, and not as *conditioning* this building, or standing in any specific relation to it ; 10 : 26, a reconstruction, incorporating part of 5 : 6, on the basis of LXX, Luc., and 2 Chron. 9 : 25 ; 12 : 31, the insertion of יִרְבָּעָם, with Luc. ; 19 : 5, שָׂם for אָחֵר, partly after LXX, Luc. (Benz. and Kittel avoid the difficulty otherwise) ; 2 Kings 9 : 25, כִּי זָכַר, with LXX, Luc., Pesh., and Vulg. ; 17 : 2, מִכֶּכֶּי־אֲשֶׁר, for רַק לֹא וְגו', with Luc. (but here surely the more difficult text is the original).

An excellent feature of these discussions, pedagogically, is the painstaking effort to reduce the variant readings of the versions to their common original.² Of course, a fundamental weakness of the whole procedure lies in the uncertainty of the text of the versions themselves.

² E. g., on pp. 9, 132 ff., 141, 157, 161, 168, 177, 224.

For this Mr. Burney is not responsible, nor for using such materials as he has. The text of the Old Testament has been greatly improved by the judicious use of the versions even in their imperfect form, and a fuller apparatus in the present book would probably be bewildering, rather than helpful, to the student. Some sense of the limitations under which the versions must be used will be gathered from the introductory remarks on "Characteristics of the Chief Ancient Versions"—although we are referred to Professor Driver's *Samuel* for quite fundamental matters. It would, however, be most desirable to make students familiar with the necessity of pushing the classification of MSS. much farther, and defining families more sharply, that their weight may be justly appreciated, before we can feel that there is really solid ground beneath our feet when we use the versions for a systematic reconstruction of the Old Testament text. It is at present convenient to operate, in large measure, with such imposing symbols as "LXX," "Luc.," and the rest. But the value of these symbols varies greatly. For example, where "Luc." is adduced as the sole witness for a proposed reading, the actual MS. authority is far from being a fixed quantity, as a brief study of Holmes and Parsons will show. Moreover, other groups are waiting to be discovered and classified. We are a long way yet from the original LXX. We should at least begin to prepare our students for the science of diplomatics, in relation to the text of the versions. Some hints as to the relative value of the versions, alone and in their various combinations, would also be welcome to this end, and, in general, some statement of the laws of corruption and emendation. As it is, Mr. Burney leaves these to be derived mainly from the specific cases, from the living teacher, or from other sources.

As all Old Testament critics must, Mr. Burney makes occasional (not excessive) use of conjectural emendation:

Thus (with Klost.) **וְזָבֻלֶיךָ** is proposed for **וְבִעְלֹת**, 1 Kings 4:16; **עַל-כָּל-הַנְּצָבִים** is inserted after **אֶחָד** in the same verse (with Klost., and, guardedly, Benz.); as a possibility, **אֶת-הַפְּרִכָּת** is inserted after **וַיַּעֲבִיר**, 6:21 (with Thenius); vss. 29, 30 are excluded from the original text (with Benz. and Kit.); in 7:8, while the omission of **יַעֲשֶׂה** (LXX) is not opposed (so Benz. "vielleicht"), a corruption of it from **עָשָׂה** after a (conjectured) **וְהִיטֹו** is offered as an ingenious alternative; in proposing **וְאֵרִבַּע פְּנוֹתֶיהָ**, vs. 30, for **וְאֵרִבָּעָה פְּעֻמֹּתֶיהָ**, Burney goes with Kamph., Benz., and Kit.; 9:25, he agrees with Benz. in thinking **אֶת-אֲשִׁי** a plausible substitute for **אֲשֶׁר**; he follows Kamph., 10:15, in reading **מֵאֲשֶׁר בָּא מִסָּחָר** for **מֵאֲנָשִׁי**

וּמִסָּחָר וְהָתָרִים—but has הָתָרִים developed from בָּא ? Kit.'s suggestion, וְהָתָרִים בָּא מִן־הָעָרִים וּמִסָּחָר, is worth considering; 11:19^b, וְהָתָרִים is read, with Winckler and Benz.; 12:30, he inserts (with a hint from Luc.) אֶל־בֵּית־אֵל וְלִפְנֵי הָאֱחָד, before עָרֵדָן, *i. e.*, "the people used to go before the one to Bethel, and before the other unto Dan" (Benz. in part), where it would have strengthened his case if he had cited 1 Chron. 21:30 in support of the meaning given to לִפְנֵי (see Driver, *New Heb. Lex.*, 817^a), especially since Kamph., Benz., and Kit. allow only "march in front of;" 18:19, he appears to agree with Wellh., Stade, Kamph., Benz., and Kit. in regarding מֵאוֹת אַרְבַּע הָאֲשֶׁרָה וּנְבִיאֵי הָאֲשֶׁרָה as a gloss; 22:48, 49, he (like Klost., Benz., Kit.) goes with Stade in reading וְנָצִיב הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוֹשָׁפָט; 2 Kings 3:15, וְהָיָה is explained (with Klost.) by supposing the omission of the end of Elisha's speech; vs. 25, he inserts (before עַד) וַיִּנְדְּדוּ אֶת־מוֹאָב, after Luc. and Klost., and then changes בְּנִיהָ to אֲבִנֶיהָ, "and they harried Moab until her sons were left in Kirhāreseth," but even so we miss a restrictive term—"only in K."—and the proposal is hardly final; 6:15, he agrees with Klost., Kamph., Benz., and Kit. (in the main) in reading מִמַּחֲרָת for מִשְׁרֵת, and בִּבְקָר for לָקוּם (*cf.* Luc.); he has a fresh and attractive reading for the troublesome verse, 7:13; 9:14^b, he inclines (rightly) to follow Grätz in reading וַיִּהְיֶה for וַיִּוָּרֶם.

It cannot be made a serious criticism that Mr. Burney sometimes cites the moderns who agree with him, and sometimes does not, for it is not given to us to be complete and consistent in such matters; but the fact may be noted, to prevent misunderstanding. Nowhere does he follow slavishly:

In some instances he maintains the Masoretic text, against the Verss. and other critics, as 1 Kings 3:4; 2 Kings 6:5 *al.*; in 1 Kings 1:6 he does not quite remove the difficulty of עָצְבוֹ (but 2 Sam. 13:21, LXX add., should be compared, with most moderns), and עָצַר (LXX ἀπεκάλυσεν), which he rejects, might mean "check," "he did not check him" (after one deed, and prevent his going on to another); 1 Kings 10:1, he hardly maintains the integrity of the text; לָשִׁים occurs elsewhere always with a *vb. actionis*; and that Solomon's fame was a result of Yahweh's fame is improbable; whether some such insertion as that of Klost. *al.*, or the simple omission of לָשִׁים as a gloss (Böttcher, Thenius), is to be preferred is not easy to say.

Other features of the book claim briefer attention. Grammatical notes are scattered through it, many of them very useful for students:

Not all of them command full assent. The difficult imperfect in 1 Kings 3:4 is hardly to be explained as a frequentative. In that case the אֵלֶּת would

have to be understood of each occurrence, and the meaning would be that Solomon repeatedly offered one thousand burnt-offerings at Gibeon. They were hardly such common affairs. It seems better to take יַעֲלֶה of continuance, giving the setting of the following incident. It will then denote the duration of the period of extraordinary worship, within which fell the night of Solomon's vision, vs. 5. Similarly, אָנֹכִי, 1 Kings 21:6, "I was speaking to Naboth, and (in the course of conversation) I said," (rather than Mr. Burney's "I begin to speak"); even יִנְהֹג; 2 Kings 9:20, Mr. Burney understands of Jehu's habit, demanding הֲוֵא נִהְיָ for a (single) present event. But this is surely an excessive purism, as the examples in Ges.-Kau., §§ 107 f., König, *Syntax*, § 160b, plainly show. In fact, the Hebrew could say "is driving madly" or "drives madly," as the English can, of an event before one's eyes, and this rendering adds greatly to the vividness of the passage. In vs. 5 I cannot think that מָה in the object-clause is an outgrowth of the indefinite sense of מָה (rare, by the way, in Hebrew). In 5:20 the explanation of צִוָּה וַיִּכְרְתוּ is so phrased as to leave room for the meaning that "Command and let them hew," "Command that they hew," and "Command, in order that they may hew," are equivalent, and easily interchangeable. Most grammars treat this delicate point inadequately. It seems best (and so I understand König, *Syntax*, § 361gβ) to suppose that the copulative idea passes immediately into the idea of the object, without the intervention of the idea of purpose. On vs. 28, explaining the accusative of manner, often puzzling to beginners, a reference would have been desirable, not only to Davidson, § 70, but also to the enlightening passage Da., § 71, R 1, where the possibility is recognized that such a word modifying a *subject* may be regarded as in apposition with it; on the other hand, in 6:7 we hardly have a "loose apposition" (the references do not show like examples), but rather an accusative of specification; cf. Da., § 71. בֵּית (בְּמוֹת), 12:31, is explained as a collective; may not בֵּית בְּמוֹת be rather a compound noun, of which only the second member is pluralized (like בֵּית אֲבוֹת, so Kit.)? On 20:8 Mr. Burney revives the view of Ewald that לֹא with the imperfect, after אֵל with jussive, softens the energetic negative, and "secures an even flow to the sentence." The point is an obscure one, and authorities disagree, but it seems to me more probable that we have here a climax, in the passage from the politer אֵל of deprecation to the more categorical לֹא of prohibition.

Explanations are sought for many difficult words: such as שִׁקְפִים, 1 Kings 6:4 (also 7:4, cf. vs. 5); שְׁלִישִׁים, 9:22; בְּלִיעַל, 21:10; עֶפֶל, 2 Kings 5:24; and others; of peculiar interpretations may be noticed שִׁים, 1 Kings 20:12, as reflexive (at best doubtful, and needing at least some defense); יִנְהֹשׁוּ, vs. 33, as "began to divine" (where "were taking the omens" has perhaps more in its favor; cf. 21:6; 2 Kings 3:4, above); עֶפֶל,

2 Kings 5:24, as "citadel," rather than "hill;" it would be easy to multiply illustrations.

In several respects, as remarked at the beginning, Mr. Burney's book over-runs—to the advantage of the student—the limits suggested by the title, and yet without being so full on these points as to become a comprehensive handbook. Thus, while we have no account of the title, and no statement of the relation with the books of Samuel, the questions of structure and composition are by no means neglected. A section of the introduction is devoted to this subject, and significant points are specially discussed, in the body of the work, as they arise. It is to be regretted that for the important subject of the sources, and the editor's treatment of them, the student is merely referred to Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, where Mr. Burney has handled these topics in an article. Given these sources, modern critics are substantially agreed—and Mr. Burney with them—that the books of Kings have taken their present Hebrew form under a threefold redaction, the first two controlled by the Deuteronomic and the third by the Priestly Code, R^{D_1} being pre-exilic (about 600 B. C.), R^{D_2} exilic, and R^P (far less important) post-exilic and provincial, not appearing in the LXX. The main question is as to the agency of R^{D_1} and R^{D_2} , respectively. Some connect, or identify, R^D with the editor of the general history from early times, of which the books of Kings form a later section. Mr. Burney does not touch upon this, and indeed it would have taken him too far. All hold that R^{D_1} supplied the original framework, and that R^{D_2} added the appendix (say, from the end of 2 Kings, chap. 23), and worked in various other passages (e. g., 2 Kings 17:19, 20) which presuppose the exile of Judah. But Mr. Burney ascribes the chronological statements, including the synchronisms, to R^{D_1} , while Benz. and Kit. assign the synchronisms to R^{D_2} , for reasons which have weight, but which Mr. Burney does not discuss. He merely gives a tabular scheme of the synchronisms, to show the differences between MT, LXX, and Luc. We find in the introduction a full list of the Deuteronomic marks of the redaction, and these are illustrated elsewhere, e. g., on 1 Kings 11:1-13. He appears to favor Winckler's analysis of 11:14-25, with its double narrative, which Benz. adopts outright, but Kit. rejects. He treats with fulness and care 11:26-43; 12:1-24, and notes the superiority of the LXX version, while he differs from Benz. in judging LXX 12:24*d-f* as inferior to MT 11:19*b* ff. He presents the "Narratives of the Northern Kingdom" (beginning with 1 Kings, chap. 17) with a special and discriminating introduction, and through-

out there are many remarks and brief discussions which keep the student's interest alive, and quicken his perception for the structural marks of the composition. I cannot refrain from calling especial attention to the strong and, in part, quite fresh argument for diversity of authorship of 1 Kings, chaps. 20 and 22, on the one hand, and 21, on the other, and unity of the authorship of 1 Kings, chap. 21, and 2 Kings 9:1—10:27.

The point of view of a student of history, as well as of language and literary monuments, is taken from time to time. One misses a summary statement of the value of Kings as history, and here, of course, the lack of a treatment of the sources, and of the chronology from the historical side, is felt. Historical notes are relatively full in connection with the fall of the northern kingdom, and with Hezekiah's reign; and the appendix reproduces—as a work of supererogation, one would almost think—the Mesha' and Siloam inscriptions, together with (transliterated) extracts from Shalmaneser II. and Sennacherib. Besides these, we have two plates (pp. 91, 92), illustrating the מִכְנוֹת of 1 Kings 7:27 ff., from the bronze stands of Larnaka and Enkomi. There are also many incidental remarks on topography, the identification of place-names, deities, and the like.

This review may be brought to a close by the consideration of one or two details of historical interest. It is not quite clear whether Mr. Burney regards 1 Kings 11:26–43 as originally belonging to the narrative of Solomon's reign. In any case, the position that the history of the division is from a Judæan hand (Wellh., Stade) seems untenable; all blame is ascribed to Rehoboam, and the right of Israel to a free choice of king (after David and Solomon) is assumed. Both these facts point strongly to an Israelitish origin (so Benz., Kit.). The northern Muşri is adopted to explain 2 Kings 7:6, and (less confidently, *cf.* König) 1 Kings 10:28; but Winckler's extravagances regarding an Arabian Muşri are absent. That at least three sources are to be distinguished in 2 Kings 18:13, 17—20:19 appears certain. Among the difficult problems furnished by these passages the most familiar relates to the "fourteenth year of Hezekiah," 18:13. Mr. Burney, like Benz. and Kit., resigns this date without a pang! To me it seems so probable that a date of such signal importance would be preserved, and 714 for Hezekiah's accession makes Ahaz's dates so much easier, that I would sooner yield many other things, *e. g.*, the originality of 20:6, and by all means the synchronism of the sixth year of Hezekiah with the ninth of Hoshea (vs. 10). Rather than abandon

it I would even accept whatever difficulty there is in supposing the accession of Sennacherib (705 B. C.), the sickness of Hezekiah, his incipient revolt (which certainly needed physical vigor to promise success), and the embassy from Merodach Baladan to have been all connected in time.

Even the most serious review of a work so abounding in details must pass over by far the greater part of it. I hope enough may have been given to indicate the grounds for the opinion that, viewed as a whole, although Mr. Burney's book is not quite a complete commentary, it offers very much to the student, and especially the English and American student, which up to the present has never been so accessible to him, and sets before him an example of patient, deliberate, well-informed, and candid inquiry. It cannot fail to stimulate and to instruct those who work with it, and to pave the way for a more intelligent and thoroughgoing appreciation of this central historical document of the Old Testament. One may differ from Mr. Burney here and there, but he has made himself indispensable for students of the books of Kings.

FRANCIS BROWN.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York.

MARTINEAU, THE MAN AND THE THINKER.

PROBABLY no men in the English-speaking world were better fitted to tell us about Professor Martineau than the authors of this work,¹ occupying as they do, after long years of most intimate relationship with their hero, the academic positions which he himself had held. As a biography in two volumes of a man whose career extended over nearly a century, little is left to be desired, and yet we could wish for a work with more of the literary finish which the great subject of the sketch always used in his writings.

Book I details with clearness and accuracy the leading facts of the busy life, while Book II, by Professor Upton, treats of the "Philosophy" of Martineau. The sources used included the "Biographical Memoranda" written by Martineau in 1877, and "severe selections from

¹ *The Life and Letters of James Martineau, LL.D., S.T.D., etc.* By JAMES DRUMMOND, M.A., LL.D., HON. LIT.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford; and a Survey of His Philosophical Work by C. B. UPTON, B.A., B.Sc., Professor of Philosophy in Manchester College, Oxford. Two vols. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1902. vii + 972 pages.